

## REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 37-41, 43-52 and 69.

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's remaining rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 7-15, 23-36, 53-68 and 70 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner contends that there is no description in the specification or the drawings that teaches the light absorbing layer covering an entire top surface of the organic resin film. The Examiner notes that the "drawings do show the light absorbing layer covering a substantial amount of the top surface organic resin layer, but not all of the top surface (for example, the light absorbing layer is not shown on the *edge portions of the top surface* of the organic resin layer") (emphasis added).

While Applicants disagree and believe that the rejected claims are fully supported by the present specification, for example by at least Figs. 1A and 5B, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the rejected claims, Applicants are amending Claims 1, 23 and 53. For example, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of "wherein the organic resin layer comprises a top surface and a side surface, wherein the light absorbing layer entirely covers the top surface of the organic resin layer, and wherein the layer comprising an organic compound is in contact with the side surface of the organic resin layer". Independent Claims 23 and 53 have been similarly amended (however, instead of "a light absorbing layer", Claims 23 and 53 recite "a light

absorbing multilayer film”). These features are clearly described in the present application. For example, Fig. 1A shows that the light absorbing layer 24 is formed on the entire top surface of the insulating layer 19 (i.e. organic resin layer), and also shows that the layer comprising an organic compound 20 is in contact with the side surface of the insulating layer 19 (i.e. organic resin layer). See attached marked-up copy of Fig. 1A (for demonstrative purposes) which shows the side surface and top surface of organic resin layer 19 and the above claimed features.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-5, 7-15, 23-36, 53-68 and 70 comply with the 35 USC §112, first paragraph, written description requirement, and it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 10, 12, 53-57, 61, 63, 67 and 70 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Hamada (US 6,114,715). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Hamada teaches that a light-absorbing layer (2) covering a substantial amount of the top surface of the organic resin (54) and a layer comprising an organic compound (104-107), citing Fig. 8 in Hamada. While Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s contentions, in light of the amendments made above in response to the §112 rejection, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 53 are clearly not disclosed or suggested by Hamada.

In particular, Hamada does not disclose that the black matrix layer (2) entirely covers the top surface of the insulating film (54) and does not disclose that the layers (104-107) are in contact with the side surface of the insulating film (54). See e.g. Figs. 8 and 9 in Hamada. Hence, Hamada does

not disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 1 and 53 of “wherein the organic resin layer comprises a top surface and a side surface, wherein the light absorbing layer entirely covers the top surface of the organic resin layer, and wherein the layer comprising an organic compound is in contact with the side surface of the organic resin layer.”

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by Hamada, and Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Hamada. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

##### Claims 8, 11, 13-15, 59, 62 and 64-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 8, 11, 13-15, 59, 62 and 64-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

##### Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Oda et al. (US 6,396,208). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 10-15, 53-54, 56-57, 59 and 61-66 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Iwase et al. (US 6,768,534). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As explained above, independent Claims 1 and 53 are not disclosed or suggested by Hamada. Iwase also does not disclose or suggest the features of Claims 1 and 53 discussed above (Iwase being cited by the Examiner for a different reason). Hence, even if it is proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the device of independent Claims 1 and 53.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 53 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 60

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9 and 60 (a second time) under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Iwase and in view of Oda. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, these claims are also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1-5, 8, 10-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al. (JP 2000-269473). This rejection is also respectfully

traversed.

As explained above, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Hamada. Kaneda also does not disclose or suggest the features of Claim 1 discussed above (Kaneda being cited by the Examiner for a different reason). Hence, even if it is proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 9

The Examiner also rejects Claim 9 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al. and Oda et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68

The Examiner also rejects Claims 23-27, 29, 31-36 and 68 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al.. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For similar reasons as discussed above for Claims 1 and 53, the claimed features of amended independent Claim 23 are also not disclosed or suggested by Hamada or Kaneda. Hence, even if it is proper to combine these references (which Applicants do not admit), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 23.

Accordingly, independent Claim 23 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim 30

The Examiner also rejects Claim 30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamada in view of Kaneda et al. and Oda et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed herein for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting an information disclosure statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered at this time and prior to the issuance of any further action for this application.

#### Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2008

  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568